

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4-20 and 22-46 are in the application. Claims 1, 19 and 37 have been amended. No new matter is added. The support for the amendments is found at page 15 of the specification. No claim is allowed.

Claims 1, 2, 4-5, 8-18 and 39-42 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Schneier et al ("Schneier," US 6,450,885) in view of Bocinsky (US 5,371,797). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The examiner avers that Schneier discloses some limitations of the claims but Bocinsky is relied upon for the teaching other limitations of the claims. The relies on Bocinsky as showing "receiving an account card associated with a client" and "deriving from the account card client information regarding the client; creating, based on the client information derived from the account card, a client tracking account for tracking the activities of the client in the electronic funds transfer network." To support this position, the examiner relies upon Bocinsky, col. 4, lines 1-59 and Fig. 3.

However, it is respectfully pointed out that Bocinsky's method does not create an account for tracking activities in the network (present claims 1 and 39) nor does it establish an account that "has not been established in the gaming environment" (present claim 39). There is only one account with which Bocinsky is dealing and that is the account that is associated with the bank card. There are no accounts created in Bocinsky's method. The user starts by inserting a bank card associated with his bank account and when he is finished using the machine, he still has only one account and it is same bank account associated with the bank card. No accounts are created.

According to the invention, the player can open a new player tracking account at any of the gaming machines in the system simply by using an account card, but that account card can have nothing to do with the gaming machine. When the player is finished using the gaming machine in the manner according to the invention, he has two accounts: the account associated with the card he used, whatever that is, and a new player tracking

account that was created using the present invention. These features and advantages are not taught in Bocinsky or the combination of Schneier with Bocinsky. It is therefore submitted to be unobvious they create a new player tracking account in a gaming network in this manner and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Schneier and Bocinsky, as applied above, further in view of Dorrough et al ("Dorrough," US 5,287,269). This rejection is respectfully traversed. The two primary references are discussed above. The examiner states that Dorrough discloses registering a user using the user's account number and providing a tracking card to the game player. To be more precise, it is pointed out that at col. 7, lines 19-34, Dorrough teaches that first an account card is issued to the user at an account station or by an account manager, then the user may go to a machine and use it to access his account. That is exactly a step that the present invention is intended to avoid. According to the present invention, the account is first created at a gaming machine without a player tracking card, so the player does not have to bother doing what is described by Dorrough. Claim 7 covers the embodiment in which the player is issued a player tracking card after the player has already played, not needing a tracking card and created an account according to the invention. Accordingly, it is submitted that Dorrough teaches away from the present invention in that it teaches a registration process with an account manager or account station before the player can play using the advantage of his player tracking account.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 7 is unobvious and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 19, 20, 22-24 and 26-37 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Kelly et al ("Kelly," US 6,645,068) in view of Bocinsky. The examiner avers that Kelly teaches the limitations of the claims except for the limitation that the player tracking system generates the player tracking account corresponding to player information derived from an account card associated with the player. The examiner again relies on Bocinsky to show this missing feature. This point has been discussed above in connection with the rejection of claims 1 and 39. Bocinsky does not teach the generation of a new

player tracking account. Moreover claims 19 and 37 specifically recite that the account card used to create the player tracking account is a card that corresponds to a remote account unrelated to the player tracking system. Bocinsky's method uses a card that is specifically associated to the bank account that is being used in the machines and to that same bank account that already existed before any machine was used by the user. Accordingly, the art cited does not form a *prima facie* case under 35 USC 103(a) and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 25 and 38 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kelly and Bocinsky in view of Dorrough. The point to be made here is similar to the discussion above relating to claim 7. Claims 25 and 38 require that the account be created at a gaming machine using the features of the present invention, and then the player may play anywhere on the tracking system *subsequently* using the account card or subsequently issued player tracking card. For the reasons given in connection with the discussion of the rejection of claim 7, claims 25 and 38 are also submitted to be unobvious.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are patentable over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests that this application be passed to issue.

Applicant hereby petitions for a one-month extension and any further extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this amendment is

to be charged to Deposit Account No. 504480 (Order No. IGT1P070). Should the examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP
/Reginald J. Suyat/
Reginald J. Suyat
Reg. No. 28,172

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100